

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF INAPPROPRIATE  
MISCELLANEOUS ACTION FILINGS

**ORDER RE: FILING OF  
MISCELLANEOUS CASES**

Over the past several days, six actions have been filed in the San Francisco Division of the United States District Court as “miscellaneous” actions even though they are not properly categorized as such. See 07-80234, 07-80245, 07-80248, 07-80249, 07-80250, 07-80251. All six actions are identical, except that the name of the plaintiff is different and the defendant in each case is a different bank/mortgage lender. The pleadings filed are identical except for the names: same font, same style, same demands. It is apparent that all filings have been orchestrated by the same person or groups of persons. For example, each action sues the defendant bank and “US Vessel DOES, ROES, and MOES 1-100 et al, US Vessel.” Each plaintiff is identified as a “Sramineus Homo, US Vessel.” Each complaint makes an approximately \$30 million demand on the defendant without alleging any basis for the demand. And each complaint is titled: “Petition For Libel Of Review Of An Administrative Judgment.”

Plaintiffs’ filing of these “petitions” as miscellaneous actions rather than civil actions

1 enables them to pay only a \$39 filing fee rather than the appropriate \$350 filing fee.  
2 Accordingly, as these actions should not be filed as miscellaneous actions, the Clerk of the  
3 United States District Court for the Northern District of California is directed to file any  
4 future similar actions as civil actions requiring a \$350 filing fee. Any questions as to the  
5 appropriate classification of a proposed complaint should be brought to the attention of the  
6 General Duty Judge.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: October 31, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CHARLES R. BREYER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California